

AMENDMENT 002 TO RFP (REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL)
Reference: T8080-170066

CLOSING DATE: August 14, 2017 @ 2:00 pm

PROJECT TITLE: IMO TIER III Emission Limits - Engine Case Studies for Small Vessels

To All Bidders:

The purpose of this Amendment is to give effect to the following:

1. Questions and Answers:

Question 1:

The scope of work involves examining 4 existing vessels and 4 new vessels. Is it TC's intent to make Tier III requirements retroactive?

Answer 1:

No. Transport Canada does not plan to make the Tier III requirement retroactive.

Question 2

The RFP notes that TC will provide information on builders and designers who have offered assistance. Is it expected that suitable existing designs will be provided to the successful bidder? If not, is it mandatory that a bidder has 4 suitable in-house designs covering each of the categories?

We are questioning whether the builders/designers are expected to provide design information, and if so in what format. For some past similar studies (e.g. on ballast water treatment) TC and industry have combined to provide representative information on vessel types of interest, to ensure that results cannot be accused of bias by selecting particularly "good" or "bad" examples.

Answer 2:

Yes. It is expected for the successful bidder to receive some support from current small vessel builders and designers. However it will be up to the successful bidder to ensure it has suitable designs for the project.

The builders and designers contact information was only to be used to help with the study, if needed. It was not expected for their help to be a proxy to providing complete detailed designs for the existing small vessels. Nothing prevents a bidder from working with established boat builders, vessel designers or engine manufacturers that it knows to ensure it can develop the required case studies.

Question 3:

Will existing design information be provided in one of the formats specified in the RFP, i.e. Shipconstructor, etc?

In this project bidders are required to offer detailed design information on 4 existing small vessels. This will effectively disqualify any bidder who does not have one of each type in a design portfolio. If the ownership in some designs is not vested in the bidder then the bidder is also prevented from offering data on that basis, unless the owner agrees to the use of the data for this purpose. These issues are a major obstacle to developing a compliant proposal.

TC itself through plan approvals has copies of much relevant data, but we do not see any mention of being able to use any of this in the project.

Answer 3:

Transport Canada will provide contact information for boat builders and small vessel designers, there was no offer to provide suitable design. It will be up to the successful bidder and the boat builders/designers as to whether designs will be provided.

Transport Canada is interested a successful bidder with experience designing and or build small vessels. It should be noted that the boat builders/vessel designers may provide the successful bidder with the necessary design that might not necessary require the successful bidder from having each type in a design portfolio, but if they do, it would be beneficial. Transport Canada, Marine Safety & Security (Environmental Programs) does not have access to this information for this purpose.

Question 4:

The RFP terms and conditions specify that IP will rest with the government. This means that bidders will be providing 4 detailed new designs and 4 repowering designs and giving up all IP in these. Will the government provide licence fees for these?

Answer 4:

No. You can consult Appendix B of the Policy on Title to Intellectual Property Arising Under Crown Procurement Contracts for more details (<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/068.nsf/eng/00005.html>)

Question 5:

The evaluation criteria are set as 70% technical and 30% price, which seems reasonable for a highly complex project of this type. However, the almost all the technical points are available merely for having been in the business for 20 years. Will TC consider increasing the component related to proposal quality?

Answer 5

The expectation is that bidder should have sufficient experience in this field to produce a quality proposal. No changes will be made to the evaluation criteria.

Question 6:

In the study of repowering of vessels in Task A, what vintage of the design is to be considered - Post 01 Jan 2016, 5 year old, 10 year old or even older?

Answer 6:

The age was not considered but the successful bidder is to explain why the chosen design is suitable.

Question 7:

What is implied by a newly designed vessel in Task A - a vessel that has been designed and constructed post 01 Jan 2016 or is the Bidder expected to develop a new vessel design conforming to IMO Tier III?

Answer 7:

No. Transport Canada does not expect the Bidder to develop a new ship design to conform to the NOx Tier III requirements. Instead, the Bidder should use an existing ship design and propose changes to the vessel design in order to meet NOx Tier III requirements.

Question 8:

Will Transport Canada confirm that the boat builders or small vessel designers have agreed to provide the information required to study each type of vessel outlined in Task A?

Answer 8

Yes.

Question 9:

Development of revised engine room layout drawings would have to be undertaken using the existing layout drawings. If answer to Question 8 above is yes, can the boat builders or small vessel designers provide the existing engine room layout drawings in AutoCAD format?

Answer 9

Transport Canada cannot guarantee builders or designers would provide existing engine room layouts drawings in AutoCAD format.

Question 10:

Are exhaust trunking drawings considered part of the machinery drawings to be developed? If yes, can the boat builders or small vessel designers provide the existing exhaust trunking drawings in AutoCAD format?

Answer 10

It would have to be something discussed between the successful bidder and the builder/designer. The successful bidder should be prepared to find other information sources as well.

Question 11:

The amount of work involved in eight different case studies is significant. Is the timeline of 15 Dec 2017 for the completion of the study firm or is there room for extending the same to 31 Mar 2018?

Answer 11:

No, this date is firm.

Question 12:

We wonder if at this stage Transport Canada can share the final report from the study "IMO TIER III Engine Study for Transport Canada" by Alion Canada? Unfortunately we could not find this report in public domain.

Our specific interest to see Alion's conclusions related to

Quote "..., it would be possible to install IMO Tier III compliant engine systems, but there would be difficulties accommodating the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) technology (required to meet the standards) on small vessels. In order to understand, measure, or quantify these difficulties, further analysis is required." Unquote

In our opinion it would be beneficial during bid stage to express how we would address specific already identified issues.

Answer 12:

No. Transport Canada owns the I.P rights of the report and the report will not be made available to bidders.

Question 13:

In RFP TC do not state how many different engines need to be evaluated. RFP only ask that 8 different vessel types be evaluated.

Theoretically one could evaluate only one engine and use the same engine in all 8 case studies.

In our opinion 4 different engines is a reasonable approach. Each engine make and type have different design requirements.

Please could you clarify what is Transport Canada preferable intent?

Answer 13:

Transport Canada will evaluate the proposal based on how the bidder proposes to address the problem, and how thorough the bid is. For example, evaluations based on only 1 engine types will be evaluated differently than a proposal based on several engine types. The more engines evaluated, the more thorough and robust the proposal will be. It is expected that the proponent would be familiar with the engine sizes based on vessel size, and would evaluate based on design parameters.

Question 14:

Our team has experience designing SCR systems for retrofit and new-build marine vessels. In many cases, it is feasible and cost-effective to retrofit SCR to the existing engine, and thus meet IMO Tier III NOx without having to repower. This scenario does not seem to have been considered by the Transport Canada.

Answer 14:

Refer to task D of the SOW.

Question 15

Will the successful proponent be excluded from bidding on the future supply and installation of NOx systems for DND (Department of National Defence) and CCG (Canadian Coast Guards) ?

Answer 15:

No. this is a Transport Canada project and has no impact on other Government of Canada contracts.

- End of Amendment 002 -